

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7, 9 to 17, 19 to 27, 29 and 30 are pending in this application of which claims 1, 11 and 21 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Kobe-shi (EP 0948978A2) in view of Junkins et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,486). As shown above, Applicants have amended the claims to define the invention more clearly. In view of these amendments, withdrawal of the art rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 1, as amended, is directed to a method of generating a shadow in a virtual three-dimensional (3D) space. The method includes adjusting a resolution of a 3D model and projecting elements of the 3D model onto a surface in the virtual 3D space. The method also includes rendering a shadow having the adjusted resolution of the 3D model on the surface using the projected elements and rendering the 3D model at a resolution that is higher than the adjusted resolution.

The applied art is not understood to disclose or suggest the foregoing features of claim 1. In particular, neither Kobe-shi nor Junkins, taken separately or in combination, disclose or suggest "rendering a shadow having the adjusted resolution of the 3D model on the surface using the projected elements and rendering the 3D model at a resolution that is higher than the adjusted resolution."

Specifically, Kobe-shi does not render shadows that have a reduced resolution. Kobe-shi describes rendering shadows that have the same resolution as the original model. Therefore,

Kobe-shi does not disclose or suggest rendering a shadow that has lower resolution than the 3D model.

Junkins describes reducing the resolution of ^{a mesh}meshes, e.g., by removing polygons from the mesh. Junkins, however, does not disclose or suggest rendering two versions of the same mesh (e.g., a shadow and an original) at different resolutions. Therefore, if Junkins were combined with Kobe-shi, in the manner suggested in the Office Action, the resulting hypothetical combination, at best, would render both an original mesh and a shadow at a reduced resolution. This is different from the invention of claim 1, which renders a shadow at an adjusted resolution and a 3D model at a resolution that is higher than the shadow resolution.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is believed to be allowable. Claims 11 and 21 roughly correspond to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 11 and 21 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons noted above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

All correspondence should be directed to the below address. Applicants' attorney can be reached by telephone at the number shown below.

Applicant : Carl S. Marshall e.
Serial No. : 09/863,217
Filed : May 22, 2001
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 10559-479001
Intel Docket: P11158

No fee is believed to be due for Amendment; however, if any fees are due, please apply such fees to Deposit Account No. 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket 10559-479001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

Paul A. Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

ATTORNEYS FOR INTEL
Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110-2804
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906